REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 15, 16 and 17 have been amended. Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled solely to further the prosecution of the application. Claims 20-24 have been added. Claims 1-17 and 20-24 are pending in the application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and in other applications.

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a "program", which according to the Office Action is non-statutory subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to recite a "computer readable storage medium" in the manner suggested in the Office Action. The concerns raised in the Office Action have been addressed by these amendments. The rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kume, U.S. Patent no. 6,203, 433. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an online organizing method. The method comprises "inputting an organizing request from a participant; searching personal information of participants of a plurality of terminals connected to a network; selecting the participants, who are compatible with one another, based on the personal information of the participants and the organizing request to organize selected participants; and sharing information by the terminals of the organized participants; and transmitting to the respective terminals control information for carrying out a specific task." According to claim 1, "the personal information of the participants includes a purpose for participation in said task and the organizing request includes a desired purpose." Applicant respectfully submits that Kume fails to disclose the claimed invention.

Specifically, Kume fails to disclose a method that selects compatible participants based on personal information and an organizing request, where the information includes the participant's purpose for the task being performed and the organizing request includes a desired purpose. Kume, by contrast, selects players for a game based on "the difference between the levels of two users." Col. 11, lines 37-45. Specifically, Kume creates a reference value Rx that indicates a permissible range of levels and when "the difference between the levels of two users falls within this range, the users are selected as players." Col. 11, lines 37-45. A participant's purpose or particular purpose request is not factored into the Kume game organization technique. As such, Kume fails to disclose the claimed invention.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable along with claim 1.

Claims 3 and 4 also recite "inputting an organizing request from a participant" and "selecting the participants, who are compatible with one another, based on the personal information of the participants and the organizing request to organize the selected participants; . . . wherein the personal information of the participants includes a purpose for participation in said program and the organizing request includes a desired purpose." As such, claims 3 and 4 are allowable over Kume for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits.

Claims 5-11 recite "organizing means for, based on personal information of participants of a plurality of terminals connected to a network and an organizing request from at least one of the participants, selecting the participants, who are compatible with one another, to organize the selected participants, said personal information including a participant purpose and the organizing request includes a desired purpose." As such, claims 5-11 are allowable over Kume for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits.

Claim 12 recites a "terminal device transmitting personal information of a user to the server; sharing information through the server among the rest terminal devices organized by the server; and cooperating with the rest terminal devices to carry out a specific task." According to claim 12, "the personal information includes a user purpose for the task." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over Kume for at least the reasons set forth above and on its own merits. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 12 and are allowable along with claim 12.

Claim 15 recites that "the personal information includes a user purpose for the task and said transmitting step occurs in response to a user request that includes a desired purpose." As such, claim 15 is allowable over Kume for at least the reasons set forth above and on its own merits.

Claim 16 recites "inputting an organizing request from a participant" and "selecting the participants, who are compatible with one another, based on the personal information of the participants and the organizing request; ... wherein the personal information of the participants includes a purpose for participation in said task and the organizing request includes a desired purpose." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable over Kume for at least the reasons set forth above and on its own merits.

Claim 17 recites "transmitting to a server personal information of users based on a user request; . . . wherein the personal information includes a user purpose for the task." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable over Kume for at least the reasons set forth above and on its own merits.

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-17 allowed.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sparks, II, U.S. Patent no. 6,352,479 (hereinafter "Sparks"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an online organizing method. The method comprises "inputting an organizing request from a participant; searching personal information of participants of a plurality of terminals connected to a network; selecting the participants, who are compatible with one another, based on the personal information of the participants and the organizing request to organize selected participants; and sharing information by the terminals of the organized participants; and transmitting to the respective terminals control information for carrying out a specific task." According to claim 1, "the personal information of the participants includes a purpose for participation in said task and the organizing request includes a desired purpose." Applicant respectfully submits that Sparks fails to disclose the claimed invention.

Specifically, Sparks fails to disclose a method that selects compatible participants based on personal information and an organizing request, where the information includes the participant's purpose for the task being performed and the organizing request includes a desired purpose.

Sparks, by contrast, selects players for a game based on statistics, a user's skill level and undisclosed user preferences. That is, the Sparks server "loads the user's game play statistics and preferences from the HDD 36 . . . and determines from the game play statistics the user's relative skill level for each one of the possible games to which the user could be matched. This determination is made by comparing the user's relative successes during previous attempts at playing each game." Col 6. , line 55-61. Although Sparks mentions user preferences, there is no disclosure whatsoever for personal information or a request that keys in on a preferred purpose for the task being

carried out. That is, a participant's purpose or particular purpose request is not factored into the Sparks game organization technique. As such, Sparks fails to disclose the claimed invention.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable along with claim 1.

Claims 3 and 4 also recite "inputting an organizing request from a participant" and "selecting the participants, who are compatible with one another, based on the personal information of the participants and the organizing request to organize the selected participants; . . . wherein the personal information of the participants includes a purpose for participation in said program and the organizing request includes a desired purpose." As such, claims 3 and 4 are allowable over Sparks for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits.

Claims 5-11 recite "organizing means for, based on personal information of participants of a plurality of terminals connected to a network and an organizing request from at least one of the participants, selecting the participants, who are compatible with one another, to organize the selected participants, said personal information including a participant purpose and the organizing request includes a desired purpose." As such, claims 5-11 are allowable over Sparks for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits.

Claim 12 recites a "terminal device transmitting personal information of a user to the server; sharing information through the server among the rest terminal devices organized by the server; and cooperating with the rest terminal devices to carry out a specific task." According to claim 12, "the personal information includes a user purpose for the task." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over

Sparks for at least the reasons set forth above and on its own merits. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 12 and are allowable along with claim 12.

Claim 15 recites that "the personal information includes a user purpose for the task and said transmitting step occurs in response to a user request that includes a desired purpose." As such, claim 15 is allowable over Sparks for at least the reasons set forth above and on its own merits.

Claim 16 recites "inputting an organizing request from a participant" and "selecting the participants, who are compatible with one another, based on the personal information of the participants and the organizing request; ... wherein the personal information of the participants includes a purpose for participation in said task and the organizing request includes a desired purpose." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable over Sparks for at least the reasons set forth above and on its own merits.

Claim 17 recites "transmitting to a server personal information of users based on a user request; . . . wherein the personal information includes a user purpose for the task." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable over Sparks for at least the reasons set forth above and on its own merits.

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-17 allowed.

New claims 20-24 have been added. Claim 20 depends from claim 1 and is allowable along with claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Claim 21 depends from claim 3 and is allowable along with claim 3 for at least the reasons set forth above. Claim 22 depends from claim 5 and is allowable along with claim 5 for at least the reasons set forth above. Claim 23 depends from claim 12 and is allowable along with

claim 12 for at least the reasons set forth above. Claim 24 depends from claim 15 and is allowable along with claim 15 for at least the reasons set forth above.

Moreover, the claims recite e.g., "wherein the personal information of participants are previously input into the terminals by the participants and stored in the terminals, said method further comprising the step of transmitting the personal information stored in the terminals when the terminals are connected to the network." These features are neither disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited references.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: October 21, 2004   Respectfully submitted,

By_____

Thomas J. D'Amico
    Registration No.: 28,371
Gianni Minutoli
    Registration No.: 41,198
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
    OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526
(202) 785-9700
Attorneys for Applicant